

19 Nov 75

STATINTL

PMCD Comments On
[] Summary Memo Dated 24 Sept 75;
Subject: Survey of PMCD, OP

A. Mission:

It is recommended that:

1. The DCI issue as an Employee Bulletin or a Headquarters Notice, or both, a policy statement outlining his manpower resource management concerns and proposed actions to ensure better management in this area.

Comment: Agree.

STATINTL

2. [] be amended to establish, by regulation, the responsibility of the Director of Personnel to administer position management and grade controls and related areas of manpower resource management.

Comment: Agree.

STATINTL

3. [] be amended to define, with some degree of precision, the totality of the Director of Personnel's/PMCD's mission for position management, classification and compensation and the nature of surveys which must be conducted to "audit the continuing validity of organizational structures and position classifications.

Comment: Agree.

B. Responsibility and Authority:

1. thru 8.:

Make certain revisions in specified Agency regulations.

Comment: Agree that the regulations need revisions but suggest a complete review and revision of the regs cited.

C. PMCD - Organization and Staffing:

It is recommended that:

1. The staff of PMCD be increased; the number (which to some degree will be influenced by the degree to which recommendations in this report are approved and implemented) to be determined by the Director of Personnel.

Comment: Agree. An increase to 25-30 would probably be required to develop and maintain both a quality standards program and a survey program.

2. A definitive plan for PMCD staffing be devised to ensure: (a) the continued existence of a core of "professional" classifiers or PMCD "careerists" and (b) a regular rotation of "other" careerists through PMCD (a tour of four years is recommended), a greater emphasis on "management" or "system analysis" orientation and/or such training for personnel assigned to PMCD.

Comment:

(a) Once benchmarks and a factor-ranking methodology have been developed, there will be less need for a core of PMCD "careerists". Under present circumstances, however, we agree that a core of "professional" classifiers (up to 50% of PMCD's assigned officers) is necessary.

(b) Agree; although a four-year tour is probably too long for a rotational assignment. We would recommend a two to three year tour with provision for extension.

3. The initiation on an immediate and urgent basis - even at the expense of a diminution or temporary cessation of cyclic surveys - of a program designed to provide "meaningful standards" for as many positions as possible. It is also suggested that this program utilize not only the work currently being done by PMCD on the new factor-ranking/benchmark system of the Civil Service Commission, but also the modular evaluation system used so successfully by PMCD with respect to certain positions in the Office of Communications.

Comment: We agree that a standards program should be developed, but we do not agree that we should cease cyclic surveys - even temporarily. Neither do we believe that the "modular evaluation system" should be utilized. The one methodology (factor-ranking/benchmark) should be applicable to all General Schedule positions, Agency-wide.

4. The recreation of a Standards Branch. It is suggested that you and your staff review the PMCD "poll" included in this report to determine those areas in which you think corrective internal action might be desirable and those in which the need for "operator education and support" are the primary requisite.

Comment: Agree. We have already taken steps within PMCD to accomplish this.

D. PMCD - Its Modus Operandi and Relationships with the Operators:

E. PMCD - Its Place in the Agency Hierarchy:

While it is recommended that PMCD remain where it is, that is, in the Office of Personnel, it is also suggested that consideration be given to clarifying the distinction - if there is indeed one to be made - between the staff and line responsibilities of the Director of Personnel and defining the mechanisms or channels by or through which these differing responsibilities can best be discharged.

Comment: Agree.

F. Centralization vs Decentralization:

It is my opinion, shared by almost all interviewed in the course of the PMCD "poll", as well as many others with whom the point was discussed in the course of this survey, that decentralization of PMCD's functions - except to the degree used in the application of the modular evaluation system in the Office of Communications, is neither necessary nor desirable.

Comment: Agree.

G. Administration of Supergrade and SPS Positions:

To meet the need for better administration of supergrade and SPS positions, it is recommended that:

1. A joint, concerted effort be made by the Office of Personnel and the "operators" to develop more realistic job descriptions for supergrade and SPS positions.

Comment: Agree.

2. PMCD using a combination of both the upcoming factor-ranking/benchmark system and factor analysis criteria of the Executive Evaluation System developed earlier (by a management consultant firm under contract to the Civil Service Commission) as part of the Federal Executive Program undertake to construct a more objective method for the creation of standards, for the evaluation of supergrade and SPS positions.

Comment: Agree, although the factor-ranking/benchmark system could simply be extended without utilizing the Executive Evaluation System.

3. To help ensure a greater uniformity in the development and application of these processes, the Director of Personnel consider making one classifier in PMCD responsible for these and related phases of the administration of supergrade and SPS positions.

Comment: Disagree. The PMCD officer responsible for a particular office should be capable of evaluating all positions of that office, including supergrade and SPS positions.

4. In recognizing the requirement for involvement of the Director in matters of supergrade and SPS personnel, and in the absence of the Executive Director-Comptroller, the Director delegate to the DDCI, or such other senior officer he might choose, responsibility for final decision making authority on actions relating to such supergrade/SPS personnel and/or positions. It might also be noted that such a delegation might properly go to the Director for Management if the Rockefeller Commission's proposal for the establishment of that position is approved and implemented.

Comment: Agree.

5. Looking to the future when hopefully the current salary "freeze" will be lifted, and recognizing the significant salary levels which would then be applied to supergrade and SPS positions, consideration be given to the establishment of upper/lower "salary limits" as opposed to "GS grades" for executive level positions. (A not entirely new idea.) Such a system, which might put a more realistic "value" on positions and provide a greater flexibility in "executive" level assignments is described in more detail in the body of this report. If found feasible "in principle," it might be initiated on a trial basis with respect to overseas stations.

Comment: Disagree. This recommendation is not compatible with other recommendations contained in the report and is more cumbersome than the "slash-grade" idea which was used for a number of years.

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2003/03/11 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100230001-8

Approved For Release 2003/03/11 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100230001-8

Recommendation #1

That the cyclic survey program, which is a main contributor to PMCD's heavy workload and of questionable value in the minds of many, be reexamined with a view toward its elimination in favor of a "maintenance" program, or its reduction in frequency and scope.

Recommend that any "personnel savings" resulting be channeled into standards program activities.

PMCD Comment:

We do not believe that the cyclic survey program is "of questionable value" or that it should be eliminated in favor of a "maintenance" one. While it is true that some past surveys have been of marginal value from a "results" standpoint, the increasing number of requests for surveys from various components as well as the tone of feedback regarding our efforts suggests that the PMCD survey is becoming one of the Agency's best management tools. Moreover, current survey inputs will be absolutely essential for standards and benchmark development, monitoring compliance with FLSA, and other position management activity.

The answer, of course, is to maintain both a quality standards program and a survey program without sacrificing one for the other. To do this would probably require an increase in PMCD's staff to 25-30. If an increase in staff is not possible, then the number of surveys must be reduced (without eliminating the cyclic program) in favor of greater effort on standards and benchmark development.

Recommendation #2

That as many as possible of PMCD's current staff be assigned to a "crash" standards development program.

Recommend that coincidental with, or at the conclusion of, this program the standards branch be reestablished.

PMCD Comment:

We agree that a carefully planned standards effort is necessary to clearly define evaluation criteria which is understandable to, and accepted by, management. In fact, PMCD had already begun this effort prior to the survey of PMCD. A "crash" program, however, implies an overnight development of standards. This simply will not be the case. A quality product will require a substantial manpower commitment over a long period of time. Several internal assignments within PMCD have already been made for this purpose.

STATINTL

Recommendation #3

That PMCD continue its work leading to the adoption of the principles of the new Civil Service Commission's Factor-Ranking/Benchmark System which will provide a desired "uniform" base that can be readily understood by operator and classifier alike. Further recommend in the interest of ensuring greater operator participation that the modular evaluation technique used so successfully by PMCD in certain Office of Communications positions (and which would seem to have similar application in places such as Div D, DDO, ISS in CRS/DDI, scientific positions in DDS&T and finance positions in DDA) be used as extensively as possible.

PMCD Comment:

We agree that PMCD should continue its work leading to the application of the CSC "Factor Ranking/Benchmark" methodology, since our system should be in harmony with CSC concepts and techniques. However, we should avoid shortcuts such as "modular evaluation" (which uses work examples rather than the four or five basic job factors that are the real basis for evaluation).

Recommendation #4

Recommend (in addition to DCI Policy Statement on subject of Position Management) that (1) a position classification training program be developed for the purpose of "educating" component personnel officers and operating officials involved in classification activities. (Such a program isn't incorporated in existing supervisory/management training courses.) (2) Publish a position management "flyer" for line managers.

PMCD Comment:

We agree, although PMCD presently runs a one-week training course two times each year, and this course is available to component personnel officers and operating officials. Any additional PMCD training effort would be limited because of the manpower required.

Recommendation #5

In the absence of an Executive Director-Comptroller or the delegation of "final classification authority to a senior officer of the Director's choice a formal appeal policy and procedural mechanism be established. This mechanism should provide for appeal by the operator, position incumbent, and - when such is necessary to maintain equity - by PMCD.

PMCD Comment:

We agree that an appeal mechanism should be established and spelled out in the regulations. Moreover, a clear delegation of classification authority should be made by the DCI, and we believe that allocating authority should be delegated to C/PMCD for all positions including supergrades. An appeals channel to the IG level should be available to the operator, the incumbent, and to PMCD.

Recommendation #6

That general controls be adopted to stop grade creep and the increase in supergrade positions and people.

PMCD Comment:

We believe that, although various controls (Agency ceiling, average grade, upper-level, and supergrade ceiling) may be imposed on the Agency by OMB, there is no need to further impose such controls at Directorate or Office levels. The number of positions within any component should be based on actual requirements rather than on an arbitrarily imposed ceiling allocation. This applies as well to the allocation of position grades on the basis of responsibilities without reference to a component's "authorized average grade."

Recommendation #7

That control of average grade and of position management be monitored by DCI review in a manner similar to the APP on the people management side.

PMCD Comment:

Before a meaningful comment can be made, more details are needed as to how this recommendation would be carried out, and what is meant by "control of position management."

Recommendation #8

Amend the Regulations to include position structure in the gross personnel ceilings at the time of allocations. Presently a Comptroller function (from a staff standpoint) the combination would be a joint Director of Personnel (PMCD) and Comptroller responsibility to the DCI with the D/Pers responsible for review and monitoring.*

*NOTE: Suggested regulatory and handbook amendments together with a proposed policy statement which the DCI might issue as an Employee Bulletin and/or Headquarters Notice are attached.

PMCD Comment:

We disagree. By including position and grade structure in the gross personnel ceilings at the time of allocations, unnecessary problems would be created. In "allotting" the numbers of positions at each grade level (GS-15, 14, 13, etc.) a ceiling at each level would thereby be established which components could cite as a basis for maintaining the number of positions "authorized" at each level. This would extend the problems we now have with respect to supergrade "ceilings".

Recommendation #9

Define the position management function at the Agency level and place it upon the Director of Personnel as the other part of the position evaluation function. The objective would be to assure that the entire Agency understood that position management and classification are staff and coordinating functions of the Director of Personnel.*

*NOTE: Suggested regulatory and handbook amendments together with a proposed policy statement which the DCI might issue as an Employee Bulletin and/or Headquarters Notice are attached.

PMCD Comment:

We agree, provided that delegations of authority are spelled out and the PMCD charter is clearly defined.

Recommendation #10

Examine the competitive promotion policy and the CSGA. Perhaps with the reduced complement and the average grade of incumbent approaching the position average grade, the CSGA should be based on position requirements not on established positions and the actual advancement of an approved candidate for promotion, particularly at upper and supergrade levels should await the opening up of a position at the appropriate grade.

PMCD Comment:

We disagree. If we are to continue operating under the CSGA, then its composition must be based on the actual grade structure.

Recommendation #11

Develop a more sophisticated basis to evaluate supergrade positions. The format and fact or analysis developed by the Civil Service Commission under that portion of the Coordinated Job Evaluation Plan applicable to the Executive Evaluation System (EES) would appear to provide an excellent base under which PMCD and "Agency executives" could build the necessary documentation for better supergrade position evaluation. A copy of the EES "factors" is attached.

PMCD Comment:

We agree, although the Executive Evaluation System (EES) is not necessarily the answer. Perhaps an extension of the same system which is under development for GS-1 to GS-15 positions would be more applicable.

Recommendation #12

Establish a periodic review and report by the Director of Personnel to the DCI on the management and utilization of supergrade positions as they become vacant.

PMCD Comment:

We disagree as to reporting on supergrade positions "as they become vacant". An annual supergrade review should be sufficient.

Recommendation #13

In the case of impasse between the Director of Personnel and the Directorates on the classification of supergrade positions - impasse formerly resolved by the Ex Dir Compt, the DDCI, or other designee of the DCI, would make the decision. This appeal channel is suggested not only to remove the Deputies and/or their Associate Deputies from the awkward position of ruling on their own supergrade structure, but also to reinforce the Directors immediate responsibility for decisions relative to supergrade positions and personnel.

PMCD Comment:

We agree that a supergrade resolution/appeal channel should be established.

Recommendation #14

The Director of Personnel should report to the Deputy Director concerned at the completion of two years of a SG PRA assignment and seek instructions on ending the PRA. The same procedure should be followed with respect to the reverse situation, namely the non-supergrade individual blocking a supergrade slot.

PMCD Comment:

We disagree. PRA reporting procedures are now on the books and generate voluminous reports which are put on a dusty shelf in the Office of Personnel and never seen again. It is doubtful that anything more would result from additional reporting on supergrade PRA's.

Recommendation #15

Quite apart from other reporting, the Director of Personnel should report once a year to the DCI on the number of Supergrade personnel PRA'd, and the number of non-SG personnel occupying SG positions. Report to be by major directorate, to show length of time of assignment and the Director of Personnel's recommendation for resolving "problem assignments" which have extended beyond a reasonable period.

PMCD Comment:

We disagree. See comment on recommendation #14.

Recommendation #16

STATINTL

STATINTL

The new responsibilities of the D/Pers should be reflected in amendments to Management of SG Personnel as cross referenced in Suggested revisions are attached.

PMCD Comment:

We disagree. See comment on recommendation #14.

Recommendation #17

STATINTL Rework [] Personnel Administration to reflect the change of focus from service to control on personnel planning and control. Include the Director of Personnel responsibilities for position management, average grade control in this general statement of policies. The policy followed should be one of centralized planning and control of positions with people management, including assignment, promotion, utilization decentralized as at present subject to D/Pers review.

PMCD Comment:

STATINTL We agree that [] should be reworked but believe that other changes are necessary, in addition to those proposed.

STATINTL

Recommendation #18

Approval and review, including periodic surveys as provided for in [redacted], of position structure and the classification of positions should remain a responsibility of the Director of Personnel through PMCD/OP.

PMCD Comment:

We agree.

Recommendation #19

a. Develop technical aids to good communication, including standards; position management training for supervisors and managers; and publish a flyer on position management.

b. Make grade and position management an evaluation factor in the performance evaluation of every line supervisor, branch chief, division chief, Office Head, Career Service Head.

PMCD Comment:

a. We agree.

b. We disagree. This would likely have no more meaning than a certification that an employee is "cost conscious".

Findings

PMCD at present is plagued with both a shortage of personnel and an inordinately heavy workload. The possibility of a ceiling increase is unlikely and PMCD's present responsibilities do not portend any diminution in workload.

The Standards Branch of PMCD was abolished in 1957 and essentially "responsibility" for standards fell to the operating branches. Unfortunately operating classification and surveys claimed precedence and this, coupled with personnel shortages, left little, if any time or staffing for standards development.

Position documentation and standards, essential factors in any position management/classification activity are lacking in many cases, inadequate in others, or obsolete or out of date. In many cases those standards that do exist are neither understood nor accepted by operating personnel. In addition, the variety of evaluation techniques used by PMCD have tended to "confuse" the operators and create a "classification mystique."

Conclusions

PMCD's programs must be reviewed to eliminate or modify "less effective" activities, establish tasking priorities and reallocate personnel assets on the basis of such priorities.

Recognizing the critical essentiality of standards to any position management/classification system, it is evident that a standards program is of the highest priority.

There must be a more uniform standards and evaluation program which can be understood by classifier and operator alike, and operator participation in the establishment of such a program to ensure its acceptance.

Recommendations

① Recommend that the cyclic survey program, which is a main contributor to PMCD's heavy workload and of questionable value in the minds of many, be reexamined with a view toward its elimination in favor of a "maintenance" program, or its reduction in frequency and scope. Recommend that any "personnel savings" resulting be channeled into standards program activities.

② Recommend that as many as possible of PMCD's current staff be assigned to a "crash" standards development program. Recommend that coincidental with, or at the conclusion of, this program the standards branch be reestablished.

③ Recommend that PMCD continue its work leading to the adoption of the principles of the new Civil Service Commission's Factor-Ranking/Benchmark System which will provide a desired "uniform" base that can be readily understood by operator and classifier alike. Further recommend in the interest of ensuring greater operator participation that the modular evaluation technique used so successfully by PMCD in certain Office of Communications positions (and which would seem to have similar application in places such as [] DDO, ISS, STATINT, CRS/DDI, scientific positions in DDS&T and finance positions in DDA) be used as extensively as possible.

Staffing - Organization - Modus Operandi (Con't)

Findings

Operating personnel's lack of understanding of the purpose and objectives of position classification, the evaluation process in effecting such classification, and the requirement for the essentials of position management poses a significant (st)acle to PMCD's discharge of these responsibilities.

During its existence the Office of Executive Director-Comptroller was in effect the Agency appeal mechanism (in other government agencies - exempt and non-exempt - there are formalized channels of appeal) to resolve operator/Office of Personnel "classification differences." In abolishing the Executive Director-Comptrollership no provision was made for an alternative formalized appeal mechanism and as a result there is "operator confusion" on the avenue of appeals.

Conclusions

Educational program for line managers and other operating officials is necessary to provide for an effective position management and classification program.

An "appeal" policies and procedures are essential to the final adjudication of classification differences which cannot be resolved by the Director of Personnel.

Recommendations

(4) Recommend (in addition to DCI Policy Statement on subject of Position Management) that (1) a position classification training program be developed for the purpose of "educating" component personnel officers and operating officials involved in classification activities. (Such a program isn't incorporated in existing supervisory/management training courses.) (2) Publish a position management "flyer" for line managers.

(5) Recommend in the absence of an Executive Director-Comptroller or the delegation of "final" classification authority to a senior officer of the Director's choice a formal appeal policy and procedural mechanism be established. This mechanism should provide for appeal by the operator, position incumbent, and - when such is necessary to maintain equity - by PMCD.

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2003/03/11 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100230001-8

Approved For Release 2003/03/11 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100230001-8

Findings

From the standpoint of formal organization, the major responsibilities for control are placed in the current Regulations as follows: (D/Pers authorities are exercised through the Position Management and Compensation Division (PMCD) OP.

25X1A
Manpower Allocations
() Ceiling Controls

DCI for Directorate Ceilings. The DD's for Ceiling within their Directorate. The Comptroller for review, monitoring and recommendation to the DCI, and for informing D/Pers of changes.

25X1A
Establishment of
Ceilings for GS-14 through GS-18 as directed by OMB.

Director of Personnel. Proposed increases require Comptroller concurrence.

25X1A
() Control over Average Position Grade

D/Pers monitors and advises line officials.

25X1A
Position Evaluation

Director of Personnel.

25X1A
Career Service Grade Authorization. (CSGA) (Promotion Limits)

D/Pers issues and monitors.

Conclusions

The question of responsibility, namely what official would be responsible for an unwanted result, is difficult to pin down in present regulations. The question becomes one of how far to go in changing things. If the Position Management and Compensation Division were transferred to the Comptroller, the ceiling and position management functions would be integrated with the position classification and salary and wage functions and this would be desirable from a control and responsibility standpoint. There would be losses however, such as the removal of the evaluation process from the other aspects of personnel management, which might make the transfer counterproductive. Another consideration in favor of the Director of Personnel is the general trend in the federal government. The Civil Service Commission, which looks to the Personnel Directors for results, has received the Presidential nod in reducing personnel costs using position management methods rather than OMB using across the board controls, the latter favoring the Comptrollers.

At present the position management function as such, that is, the determination of numbers of positions, grade levels, occupational requirements is not clearly defined at the Agency level, but would seem to be, as far as can be told from () a Comptroller function. In contrast, the function is very clearly defined at Office of Personnel level to be a PMCD responsibility.

The CSGA, which serves as a reference point for the Annual Personnel Plan is based on positions rather than incumbents at a given date. Thus it shows a 28.4 percent promotion possibility in FY 74 against 19.7 percent in FY 72.

Recommendations

(8) Amend the Regulations to include position structure in the gross personnel ceilings at the time of allocations. Presently a Comptroller function (from a staff standpoint) the combination would be a joint Director of Personnel (PMCD) and Comptroller responsibility to the DCI with the D/Pers responsible for review and monitoring.*

(9) Define the position management function at the Agency level and place it upon the Director of Personnel as the other part of the position evaluation function. The objective would be to assure that the entire Agency understood that position management and classification are staff and coordinating functions of the Director of Personnel.*

(10) Examine the competitive promotion policy and the CSGA. Perhaps with the reduced complement and the average grade of incumbent approaching the position average grade, the CSGA should be based on position requirements not on established positions and the actual advancement of an approved candidate for promotion, particularly at upper and super-grade levels should await the opening up of a position at the appropriate grade. 25X1

*NOTE: Suggested regulatory and handbook amendments together with a proposed policy statement which the DCI might issue as an Employee Bulletin and/or Headquarters Notice are attached.

Findings

25X1A

Management of Super-
grade Personnel.

The DCI, the
Management Committee,
D/Pers, Supergrade
Review Panel. (Also
subject to OMB Ceil-
ing)

Conclusions

Dissatisfaction with and inadequacy of present organizational arrangements for administering supergrade positions, ceiling and people are illustrated by a paper on the subject prepared in Dec 1974 by the DDA for circulation to the Comptroller and the D/Pers. Briefly stated this concept would change present policy and procedure as established by Agency Regs and Ex-Dir Memo of 12 Dec 75 and prior policies. It would take the DCI out of the SG picture except for annual review of distribution and incumbency as against original allocation to the Deputies, place the authority for administering SG personnel with the Deputies, allow PMCD to classify positions to which SC ceiling had been allotted by the Deputies. Two additional procedures were provided. The Secretary of the Management Committee would, in the event of a reallocation of SG positions or ceiling, staff out and present to the Director, with the assistance of the Comptroller, such a request. The second would provide that in the event of disagreement between OP/PMCD and the Directorate on the classification of a supergrade position, the Comptroller together with the four line Associate Deputy Directors (A/DD's) would decide.

Recommendations

⑪ Develop a more sophisticated basis to evaluate supergrade positions. The format and fact or analysis developed by the Civil Service Commission under that portion of the Coordinated Job Evaluation Plan applicable to the Executive Evaluation System (EES) would appear to provide an excellent base under which PMCD and "Agency executives" could build the necessary documentation for better supergrade position evaluation. A copy of the EES "factors" is attached.

⑫ Establish a periodic review and report by the Director of Personnel to the DCI on the management and utilization of supergrade positions as they become vacant.

⑬ In the case of impasse between the Director of Personnel and the Directorates on the classification of supergrade positions - impasse formerly resolved by the Ex Dir Compt, the DDCI, or other designee of the DCI, would make the decision. This appeal channel is suggested not only to remove the Deputies and/or their Associate Deputies from the awkward position of ruling on their own supergrade structure, but also to reinforce the Directors immediate responsibility for decisions relative to supergrade positions and personnel

SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/03/11 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100230001-8
Position, Grade and Manpower Controls (Cont'd)
(Responsibilities)

25X1A

Findings

Management of Supergrade Personnel (Cont'd)

☐ Personnel Rank Assignment

Definition: A personal rank assignment is the assignment of an employee to a position of a grade lower than his grade.

(Responsibilities: PRA's may be approved by D/Pers if one of five conditions met, one of which is competitive promotion. Also requires approval for a specific maximum period as agreed by Operating Official, Head of the Career Service.

25X1A Current Status: As of 12 Sept 75 there were 58 Supergrade individuals in non-supergrade positions.

(☐ Assignment to position of higher grade. There were also 98 non-supergrade individuals in supergrade positions. D/Pers approval required only if assignment is more than two grades above personal grade.

Conclusions

A situation which reflects a significant number of supergrade positions occupied by non-supergrade personnel while at the same time supergrade personnel are slotted below their supergrade level, does not appear, on the surface at least, to be very satisfactory.

While some of this apparent "discrepancy" may be necessary "temporarily" by the workings of competitive promotion system or operational or other requirements the continuance of such assignments beyond a reasonable period would not appear warranted without the strongest justification.

Present procedure by which the Head of the Career Service reports to the Director of Personnel on PRA's and corrective steps being taken do not differentiate between Supergrade PRA's and PRA's in lower level positions. Nor are there special controls on the reverse, that is, assignment of non-supergrade personnel to supergrade positions unless the assignment involves a position more than two grades above the individual's grade.

Recommendations

(14) The Director of Personnel should report to the Deputy Director concerned at the completion of two years of a SG PRA assignment and seek instructions on ending the PRA. The same procedure should be followed with respect to the reverse situation, namely the non-supergrade individual blocking a supergrade slot.

(15) Quite apart from other reporting, the Director of Personnel should report once a year to the DCI on the number of Supergrade personnel PRA'd, and the number of non-SG personnel occupying SG positions. Report to be by major directorate, to show length of time of assignment and the Director of Personnel's recommendation for resolving "problem assignments" which have extended beyond a reasonable period.

(16) The new responsibilities of the D/Pers should be reflected in amendments to ☐ Management and ☐ SG Personnel as cross referenced in ☐ and ☐ Suggested revisions are attached.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

Findings

Agency practice has been to decentralize the management of people to the career services while maintaining centralized management of positions and ceilings.

The management of supergrade personnel, positions and ceiling has always been an integrated process with the Executive Director-Comptroller (final arbiter for the DCI of both positions and people subject to the external controls of the Office of Management and Budget on numbers of Upper Level and Supergrade people.

In March 1973, before assuming office as Director of Central Intelligence, Wm. E. Colby expressed his philosophy concerning the ancient dilemma of centralized versus personnel management:

As to alternatives between centralized personnel management and the decentralized system we have today, I think neither is the right answer. The decentralized system provides personalized treatment of the enormous variety of individual skills our people have. At the same time the decentralized system allows inequities and inconsistencies in personnel management because of bureaucratic divisions. The latter problem can be solved by centralized reporting of personnel activities and by imposing a common planning process and guidelines for decision making.

Conclusions

A new balance between centralized and decentralized personnel management must be found, one suited to the nature of the times.

In accordance with the Director's statement, this balance will require a shift of some responsibility to the operating components (decentralization) and some shift in the opposite direction, involving common planning guidelines.

Recommendations

(17) Rework [] Personnel Administration to reflect the change of focus from service to control on personnel planning and control. Include the Director of Personnel responsibilities for position management, average grade control in this general statement of policies. The policy followed should be one of centralized planning and control of positions with people management, including assignment, promotion, utilization decentralized as at present subject to D/Pers review. STATINTL

(18) Approval and review, including periodic surveys as provided for in [], of position structure and the classification of positions should remain a responsibility of the Director of Personnel through PMCD/OP. STATINTL

Findings

'Administration should be the handmaid of operations' said Allen Dulles in 1947 before he became part of the CIA and his message has had an impact for twenty-five years. While the substantive activity of the Agency should predominate perhaps it is time for another message, one which would include position management as an organization value.

In the main, operating officials see position management and classification as somebody else's job, and the system as something to beat. Position classifiers are seen as bureaucratic, negative, vacillating, and externally oriented, surrounded by mystique.

Most position classifiers are competent in their area of speciality. However they see themselves as besieged, fighting an uphill if not a losing battle, lacking in support at the highest levels, misunderstood.

The DCI has been an excellent communicator on many aspects of personnel administration such as changes in the Career Services, the Annual Personnel Plan, the Personnel Approaches Study Group, the Personnel Development Plan; but not much has been said officially on an equally important part of personnel management, namely position management and grade control.

Conclusions

In addition to the program changes required if position management and classification is to be made effective, an upcoming need is to do some thinking about the communications task. The role of structure is not understood, being under emphasized on one hand by the emphasis on flexibility and perhaps overemphasized in a mechanistic way on the administrative side.

One clue to the communication problem is described by Arch Patton, a director of McKinsey and Co. and Chairman of the Presidential Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries:

"A more effective system would result from involving the line or functional manager in the evaluation decision. . . . it would sharply reduce the upward float of positions in the structure by strengthening the line manager's position in the evaluation process. When it becomes his decision and not the decision of some technician whose judgement he instinctively questions, the manager will tend to accept the values as established, and be less tempted to beat the system. . . ."

Recommendations

19 Good organization communication is based on confidence and is largely an aspect of leadership, to be achieved in part in the case of position management by the formal steps, announcement of intention, and regulatory and other policy/procedural amendments as discussed elsewhere in this report.

Technical aids to good communication would include the development, with operator participation**, and promulgation of position standards, the inclusion of position management and classification in the training curriculum for supervisory and management training, the publication of a flyer, such as the Navy Dept's, on position management. [A "first-cut" draft of such a pamphlet based on the Navy "flyer" is included in this report.]

Make grade and position management an evaluation factor in the performance evaluation of every line supervisor, branch chief, division chief, Office Head, Career Service Head. Make all levels of supervisors which originate or propose official statements of duties and responsibilities understand that they are certifying what is in effect a pay-roll document; and that while the Director of Personnel through PMCD, OP has the staff and coordinating responsibility, final responsibility rests with line management.

** The work module Evaluation System referred to elsewhere in this report insures this because it requires direct input from operating officials.